

Appl. No. 10/682,080  
Response Dated May 11, 2005  
Reply to Office action dated February 18, 2005

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants have received and carefully reviewed the Office Action mailed February 18, 2005 and the Advisory Action mailed May 3, 2005. Claims 4, 5 and 19 have been canceled without prejudice, and claims 1, 6, 7, and 20-21 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments is found in the specification, claims, and drawings as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-3, 6-18 and 20-22 are pending. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

**Interview**

Applicants thank the Examiner for discussing potential claim amendments on May 9, 2005. The claim amendments presented herewith are those indicated by the Examiner as placing the application in condition for allowance.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 5-15, and 19-20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1-4, 16-18, 21, and 22 are rejected as being anticipated by Takahashi et al. (US 5,261,455). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner indicated that claims 5-15 and 19-20 were objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Independent claims 1 and 21 have been amended to include the limitations of dependent claims 4 and 5. Dependent claims 4 and 5 have been canceled without prejudice. Amended independent claims 1 and 21 are now believed to be in condition for allowance. For similar and other reasons, dependent claims 2-3, 6-18, 20 and 22 are also

Appl. No. 10/682,080  
Response Dated May 11, 2005  
Reply to Office action dated February 18, 2005


believed to be in condition for allowance.

In addition, claims 1 and 21 have been amended to recite a control solenoid apparatus including a pressure sensor for sensing pressure in an end cavity defined by a first end of the spool valve and an end of the first longitudinal cavity. Takahashi et al. do not appear to teach or suggest such a sensor. It appears the only sensor taught or suggested by Takahashi et al. is the lateral acceleration sensor 44, which "serves to monitor lateral acceleration acting on the vehicle body to provide a signal  $Y_G$  indicative of the magnitude of the lateral acceleration or rolling motion of the vehicle body to the controller 10." See column 8, lines 39-43 and FIG. 1. Furthermore, Takahashi et al. do not appear to teach or suggest a reason one of ordinary skill in the art would wish to modify the system to include a sensor for sensing pressure in an end cavity. Takahashi et al. thus fail to teach each and every element of the independent claims, and similarly the claims dependent thereon. As such, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested. It is submitted that, in light of the above remarks, all pending claims 1-3, 6-18, and 20-22 are now in condition for allowance. If a telephone interview would be of assistance, please contact the undersigned attorney at 612-359-9348.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: May 11, 2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Brian N. Tufte, Reg. No. 38,638  
CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC  
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 800  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403-2420  
Telephone: (612) 767-4574  
Facsimile: (612) 359-9349